

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

(DRAFT Minutes)

APRIL 4, 1997, 9 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.

COLUMBIA RIVER INTER-TRIBAL FISH COMMISSION OFFICES

PORTLAND, OREGON

I. Introductions and Review of Agenda.

William Stelle, National Marine Fisheries Service regional administrator and Executive Committee chairman, thanked everyone for coming, thanked the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission for the use of its facilities, led a round of introductions and reviewed the agenda for today's meeting. A copy of the April 4 EC agenda, together with a list of meeting participants, are attached as Enclosures A and B. The following is a distillation, not a verbatim transcript, of items discussed and decisions made at this meeting.

Please note that some of the enclosures referenced in these minutes may be too lengthy to routinely attach. To obtain copies of any of the enclosures from the April 4, 1997 Executive Committee meeting, please call Kathy Ceballos of NMFS at 503/230-5420.

One housekeeping item, Stelle began -- last night, Judge Malcolm Marsh issued a ruling in the American Rivers litigation. As I understand his ruling, Judge Marsh dismissed the claims against the National Marine Fisheries Service by the environmental plaintiffs and the State of Oregon, Stelle said. Judge Marsh's ruling does not alter our commitment to this regional forum, or to this implementation process -- our focus is on further progress in this forum.

Other opening comments? asked Stelle. Yes, replied Wendell L. Hannigan of the Yakima Nation. Recognizing the importance of having the various Federal agencies, states and tribes sit down together at the same table, we still have some concerns about the rules and procedures for this forum, and, indeed, are still not entirely clear how it came into existence. We will discuss those issues in more detail during Agenda Item VI, Stelle replied.

While I welcome everyone to this table, said Tonia Garcia of CRITFC, I would like to re-emphasize to the Federal parties that this does not qualify as a government-to-government consultation with the tribes. We are entitled to a government-to-government consultation to resolve those issues with NMFS that our tribes feel require further in-depth discussion, she said.

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes also have some concerns about this forum as the place where final decisions are made, said Lionel Boyer -- I don't believe that our tribes are willing to accept any decisions from this forum.

The Umatilla Tribes share the concerns of the other tribes that have spoken today, said Rose Mary Narcisse -- we always practice consultation, and in order to resolve any important issue, we have to talk across the table and air it completely, face to face. It's not good when we hear afterwards what has been decided for us. We have good ideas; we've had good management

practices over the years, and we are willing to cooperate with the state and Federal agencies as much as we can. However, the consultation portion of this process is very important, and it has to be followed through on if this process is going to work.

One other item, said Mary Verner of the Spokane Tribe -- the Spokane Tribe, and probably other tribes as well, do not have the resources to attend the TMT, IT and Executive Committee meetings. In developing the agenda for the Executive Committee, will we be provided with an overview of the issues that were discussed and resolved at TMT and IT prior to this EC meeting? That's a fair point, Stelle replied -- if you're comfortable with the idea, perhaps we could discuss it further during Agenda Item VI. He added that detailed minutes are prepared for each of the TMT and IT meetings, and are distributed to all of the members of this committee.

II. Presentation of 1997 Migration Issues Recommended by Idaho Rivers United et al. (Information Item).

Jim Baker of the Sierra Club, Charles Ray of Idaho Rivers United and Buzz Ramsay of the Northwest Sport Fishing Industry Association spent a few minutes discussing 1997 migration issues and related points. They distributed Enclosure C, a document entitled "1997 Salmon and Steelhead Migration -- Operating Plan for the Snake and Columbia Rivers and Federal Dams."

I'd like to begin by commenting on the proposed guidelines for the Technical Management Team, Baker said. In the draft that has been prepared for decision today, there is a provision that would allow the Federal action agencies to not go forward with a requested in-season management action if there is a difference of opinion about best available science. We think this is an extremely regrettable proposal, said Baker, and hope that the Executive Committee will see fit to revise or delete it. I would like to remind the Federal agencies that they are not the Army Corps of Biologists, the Bonneville Salmon Administration or the Bureau of Salmon Recovery. The fisheries agencies and tribes are the proper entities to be making decisions about what is the best available science. In our view, this provision is a violation of the Federal obligation to co-manage salmon in the Columbia Basin with the tribes and the states.

Baker then yielded the floor to Ray, who focused his remarks on the 1999 decision, by the Federal agencies, about whether to commit to a path of improved in-river migration in the Snake and Columbia Rivers or to stick with the status quo -- barging fish. This is a decision that, under both the NMFS Biological Opinion and the Power Planning Council's Strategy for Salmon has been deferred until 1999, he said.

However, said Ray, that decision is in the process of being made right now via the Corps of Engineers' General Construction fund for the years 1997-2000. That fund allocates the spending of roughly \$600 million. We took a look at that fund, and followed the money, he continued. And when you follow the money, you discover that the Federal agencies are committed to the status quo -- barging fish. They are spending well over half of their construction budget on measures that do nothing other than facilitate the barging of fish.

The Corps' construction plan is an irretrievable commitment of resources, and it clearly prejudices any decision that will be made in 1999, Ray said. I can assure you that if the Corps continues on this path, the first thing we will hear in 1999 is, "We've already spent all of this

money, it's too late to turn back."

As an alternative, Ray continued, CRITFC and the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes have put together a five-year work plan for mainstem construction activities that offers clear advantages over both the NMFS Biological Opinion and the Council's plan. The CRITFC/Sho-Ban plan does not defer critical decisionmaking; it contains specific, biologically-sound measures necessary to restore salmon to legally-required levels, a workplan, a timeline, and a budget to do the work. I have brought a letter today, signed by Idaho Rivers United and four other environmental and sport fishing groups endorsing the mainstem construction portion of the CRITFC/Shoshone-Bannock plan, and I would like to give that letter to Mr. Stelle now.

With that, Ray yielded the floor to Buzz Ramsay. I work for Luhr Jensen and Sons, a fishing tackle manufacturer located in Hood River, Oregon, Ramsay began. The company was founded in 1932, and was built on the Columbia River salmon runs. For 22 years, I have been sales and promotion manager for this company, and I am very aware of the plight that our industry is in. As the salmon runs have declined, so has our business. We go bankrupt when there is no season, and it is upsetting to me, and to the entire sport fishing industry, that we can't seem to turn things around.

If you have lost sight of what a great economic resource sport fishing could be, I'd like to site an example for you, Ramsay continued. In the state of Michigan, where they introduced Pacific salmon in 1966, the sport fishing industry has grown in proportion to those returning runs, to the point that, by the 1980s, the sport fishing industry surpassed the automobile industry in economic importance to the state. It's not just the lure-making industry -- it's charter boat operators, guide services, hotels, boat, motor and trailer manufacturers, restaurants etc.

So we here in the Northwest would love to see salmon turn around, said Ramsay, and we understand that this group can do something about it. The weather this year is on our side -- we have a tremendous snowpack, and the Columbia is going to flow. If there has ever been a year when we should not barge, and let fish stay in the river where Mother Nature can flush them out to sea, this is the year. I'm here on behalf of the Northwest Sport Fishing Industry Association, he said, to ask this group to not barge a single fish this year.

I would like to add that, if barging fish is such a good thing for fish, why haven't we had a season for Columbia River summer chinook since 1964? Ramsay asked. If there has ever been a year to leave fish in the river, this is it.

Has NMFS tried to address these issues with all of the tribes individually, at forums like the TMT or IT? asked Garcia. That goes to your earlier question about government-to-government obligations, Stelle replied. Particularly in the context of the TMT, which deals with in-river, in-season management issues, we have proposed this regional forum as the most efficient mechanism by which all parties can come together at different technical levels to offer our expertise and discuss the science and the information. All of the states and tribes are invited participants in that forum. We have not tried to undertake a government-to-government consultation with each of the tribes on the river on these matters, in part because of the timeliness involved in developing and executing decisions on running the river in the spring, Stelle said. We recognize, however, that the sharing of ideas and expertise within the regional forum is not the same, in NMFS's mind, as a formal government-to-government consultation with policy

representatives of the individual tribal governments.

So is it feasible that, given barging's track record and the record high flows we're expecting in 1997, NMFS will honor the tribes' recommendation that no more than one-third of the fish be barged? asked Garcia. Because it's time for a common-sense approach. We had salmon before you came here -- we had a natural river run. In our view, greatly reducing the percentage of fish barged would go a long way toward returning the system to a natural river. We will have a full discussion of the tribes' proposal later, under Agenda item 3B, Stelle replied.

III. 1997 Operational and System Configuration Issues.

A. Libby and Hungry Horse Operations (Information Item). Chip McConnaha of the Power Planning Council staff and the Independent Scientific Advisory Board spent a few minutes briefing the EC on the background, methodology and conclusions of the ISAB's Report 97-3: "Ecological Impacts of the Flow Provisions of the Biological Opinion for Endangered Snake River Salmon on Resident Fishes in the Hungry Horse and Libby Systems in Montana, Idaho and British Columbia." This report is attached as Enclosure D; please refer to this document for the detailed information contained in McConnaha's presentation.

The bottom line of the report, according to McConnaha:

The ISAB review found that the biological effects of summer drafting are not likely to drive resident fish populations to extirpation in Hungry Horse and Libby Reservoirs. Nevertheless, late summer drawdown of the reservoirs adversely effects resident fishes in the reservoirs, as well as those downstream of the projects through increased flows in the streams and lakes below the two reservoirs. Finally, the question of benefits of August flow augmentation to endangered Snake River salmon is a complex one with information that is subject to more than one interpretation. In *Return to the River*, the Independent Scientific Group concluded that a flow-survival relationship remains to be demonstrated. The question is currently being pursued by the ISAB in other contexts.

Questions or comments? asked McConnaha. We are particularly concerned about the lack of technical assessment about whether or not it is appropriate to use winter drafting as an equivalent to the summer drafts, said Joyce Cohen of the Northwest Power Planning Council. Also, she said, is there any empirical data on survival and mortality in the reservoirs, relative to reservoir operations? We're a little concerned about why the ISAB didn't come back with some recommendations about further work that would allow them to make real judgements about mortality and survival of fish at various places in the reservoir and at various reservoir levels. Those are two questions we would like the ISAB to consider further; also, we would like an opportunity to make written comments on this report, and to submit further technical and policy concerns. We have some questions about balance, both of the composition of the ISAB group and of the literature reviewed during the development of this report, Cohen said.

We would welcome any comments you might have, McConnaha replied. As for your comment about balance, the group did primarily talk to Montana reservoir experts, because these are Montana reservoirs. If the ISAB had looked at the flip side -- the benefits to anadromous fish -- the list of people and expertise would have been considerably larger. It just seems to me that, if you're going to make a decision to broaden the original charge or question in the interest of

"balance," then you have an obligation to broaden the scope of your scientific analysis as well, said Cohen.

I couldn't agree more, Joyce, said ISAB chairman Rick Williams. Those are issues we really struggled with within the group. The original questions asked only about impacts of deep summer drafting on resident fish upstream of the projects. Because we have a lot of information about the effects of those drafts immediately downstream from the projects as well, and because those effects are quite dramatic, we felt it incumbent to speak to those issues. As far as expanding it further, to include effects on anadromous fish all the way down through the system, we felt that we simply had to draw some sort of a boundary if we were to complete the task within the available time-frame. However, I think the group would point to the same issues Joyce did as some of the report's major deficiencies, and some of the logical next steps for analysis, Williams said.

I would also like the ISAB to draw a very bright line between the biological impacts of the power production/flood control drawdowns in the winter and spring, and the biological impacts of the summer drawdowns, Cohen said. I would like to see you develop a much more detailed, scientifically sound analysis of those seasonal effects. We'll look forward to receiving your written comments, said Williams.

How are decisions made about what particular questions the ISAB should investigate, and where do the tribes fit into the process for framing those issues? asked Wendell Hannigan. In general, the questions considered by the ISAB are submitted through the Power Planning Council and NMFS, McConnaha replied. However, both agencies have made it very clear that they are open to questions from other sources. This particular question, for example, was developed by the Implementation Team at the request of the State of Montana, with, I assume, tribal input.

In section 7 of this report, the ISAB makes the recommendation that NMFS undertake an assessment of the biological and ecological tradeoffs between the benefits of spring and summer flow augmentation to Snake River and other salmon, and the accompanying effects on other water uses, including resident fish, said Stelle. Do you think that either the data or the scientific tools exist to undertake just such an assessment? That is the heart of the question, and I honestly don't know the answer, said Williams. It's a question we've wrestled with for decades, added McConnaha -- it would probably behoove us to do a synthesis of all of the available information about summer flow -- to my knowledge, that really hasn't been collected and analyzed from an ecological perspective. At this point, however, I think that's really all you could do without undertaking extensive new studies.

I'm intrigued by the idea of obtaining an analysis of the existing data on the benefits of spring and summer flow augmentation, although I hesitate to pile assignment after assignment on the ISAB, said Stelle. Perhaps it would be helpful if we were to assign an ISAB subgroup to scope that task, and develop a brief issue paper, describing the problem and how it might be attacked, suggested Williams. I personally think that would be useful, Stelle replied. And I would suggest that you fold the available information about the biological impacts of winter drafts into this analysis as well, suggested Bill Shake of USFWS.

From our perspective, I don't know that this assignment was the best use of the ISAB's time, said Garcia. I think their time might have been better spent refining key recommendations in *Return*

to the River, such as the ecological benefits of drawdowns, or the most appropriate structural configuration path for the hydrosystem to recover a basinwide salmon population. The bottom line is that the tribes, as co-managers of the salmon, need to play a more direct role in making assignments and setting direction for the ISAB, Garcia said. I think that is something that needs to be formalized.

That is an accurate observation -- the Memorandum of Agreement does recognize a role for the tribes in reviewing and establishing work assignments for the ISAB, Stelle said. I suggest that we set up a meeting between the ISAB membership and all of the Columbia River tribes in order to lay out the ISAB's current workplan, and to discuss the options for future assignments. Garcia agreed that this would be appropriate, from a tribal standpoint. I'll expect to hear from Chip about scheduling that meeting, said Williams.

I understand that an analysis of the flow/survival relationship is part of the task before PATH, said Mary Verner. Any idea when that evaluation might be complete? We'll be getting more of a PATH update later in the agenda, said Donna Darm of NMFS, but in brief, we are expecting a prospective analysis of spring/summer chinook by the fall of 1997, and a prospective analysis of fall chinook by fall 1998.

B. Idaho Fish Transport Strategy (Decision Item). Ed Bowles of IDFG distributed Enclosure E, a document outlining the Idaho proposal for transportation during the 1997 spring migration period. He put up a series of overheads and went through the Idaho transport plan in some detail (see Enclosure E for specific justification, discussion points, references and supporting data for the Idaho plan).

The Idaho proposal makes two specific system operational requests, said Bowles:

- 1) Alternate daily between transportation and bypass of salmon and steelhead smolts collected at Lower Granite, Little Goose and Lower Monumental Dams during the spring migration period (approximately April 10 through June 20)
- 2) Manage nighttime spill to the maximum total dissolved gas (TDG) levels allowed by state water quality agencies at all dams on the Lower Snake and Columbia rivers when spring migrants are present (recognizing that spill from limited hydraulic capacity and lack of power demand will likely result in TDG levels exceeding state water quality standards for much of the spring migration period).

The goal of the Idaho proposal is simply to allow more fish to migrate in-river during what promises to be one of the best water years in recent memory, Bowles said. You have heard several other entities urge you to increase the percentage of in-river migrants in 1997; the State of Idaho shares that view as well. This specific operation is intended to result in 46% of the steelhead smolts and 58% of the chinook smolts originating above Lower Granite Dam being allowed to migrate in-river in 1997. Bowles added that this operational scenario is closer to the in-river migration proportions that occurred in 1982-'84, years which produced some of the highest flows and best smolt-to-adult returns on record; it is consistent with the Transport Rule Curve developed for NMFS; it is functionally feasible, will not compromise ongoing studies, and does not require additional flow, spill or funding.

Please bear in mind also that this operational proposal represents a significant compromise on the

part of its proposers, said Bowles -- CRITFC, one of its supporters, advocates full in-river migration with zero transportation, while the State of Idaho advocates that two-thirds of the run be allowed to migrate in-river.

Next up was Brian Brown, who described the Implementation Team's efforts to reach consensus on the Idaho/CRITFC transport proposal. We met yesterday to discuss this issue further, Brown said; however, we were unable to reach consensus, and as a result, this issue now comes to the Executive Committee for decision.

Brown spent a few minutes describing the IT's concerns about the Idaho/CRITFC transportation proposal, which has been under review by three different IT technical committees -- one reviewing the methods used to estimate the effects of the various operational alternatives on the proportion of fish transported, one reviewing the logistics of implementation, and one reviewing the potential to gain new information, as well as the risks to ongoing studies, associated with each alternative.

The first of these technical groups was able to agree on a methodology to estimate the effects of the operational alternatives, Brown said. The second technical group concluded that all of the alternatives contained in the Idaho/CRITFC proposal (see Enclosure E, pp. 19-20 for the range of operational proposals modeled under the Idaho/CRITFC transportation strategy) are implementable, said Brown. However, this group did not recommend one specific alternative as having clear advantages over the others.

The third work group looked at the potential of each alternative to give us some new and useful information about how the system works, Brown continued. The key issue that we have an opportunity to learn something about in 1997 is the benefit of transporting steelhead. The currently-planned transport operation for the spring of 1997 would result in 84% of the steelhead run being transported, Brown said. That's a pretty high percentage of steelhead to be transported -- too high, in Idaho's view, and that is at the root of this proposal.

Up until this year, NMFS and most of the salmon managers were fairly comfortable with the amount of information we have about steelhead transportation benefits, Brown continued. While we've all been frustrated that transportation in and of itself does not seem to have been enough to avoid a proposed ESA listing for steelhead, we at least thought there was agreement that, within the system as it exists, steelhead would be better off being transported. That fundamental assumption has now been called into question.

With that in mind, the third IT subcommittee concluded that it would be possible to do a complete transport evaluation in 1997, Brown said. We discussed it at yesterday's IT meeting, and although there was acknowledgement that this would be a very large study to try to pull together between now and the start of the 1997 migration season, there was no opposition to NMFS pursuing that study. He added that such a study would not be dependent on any particular transport alternative being chosen.

So with the reports in from the three technical subcommittees, we have agreement that we can calculate the percent transported based on a given operation; we agree that all of the proposed Idaho/CRITFC alternatives are implementable; we agree that it doesn't make any difference which alternative is implemented from the standpoint of what we can learn in 1997, Brown said.

So it came down to a decision based on the percentages. At the IT, we narrowed it down to two alternatives. The first of these is Alternative 7 (p. 19 of Enclosure E), which calls for alternating days of transport and bypass to the river at Lower Granite, Little Goose and Lower Monumental Dams. This alternative is expected to result in 58% of the chinook and 46% of the steelhead being allowed to migrate in-river.

That alternative was objected to in the IT's consensus process by NMFS, Brown said. The basis for our objection is NMFS's belief that, while some deviation from last year's transportation operation is appropriate for 1997, transporting only 42% of the chinook run was too much of an action to take in an attempt to get below 60% transportation. We felt that there are other alternatives in the package that we would be more comfortable with, Brown said.

The second alternative the IT discussed -- the alternative NMFS is more comfortable with -- was Alternative 6, Brown continued. Alternative 6 calls for daily transport at Lower Granite, and transport/in-river bypass on alternating days at Little Goose and Lower Monumental. Again, however, the IT was unable to reach consensus on Alternative 6; it was objected to by CRITFC, which reiterated its position that there should be zero transport in 1997. COE and BPA also raised various objections to both alternatives, Brown said.

Questions or comments? asked Brown. We've been bargaining for 20 years, and the salmon runs have continued to decline, said Garcia. How much more information do you need? I am asking again -- out of the alternatives in this proposal, is there any way to ensure that two-thirds of the fish are left to migrate in-river? There are alternatives that would leave more fish in the river, yes, Brown replied. The alternative on this list that comes closest is Alternative 7, which CRITFC and Idaho are supporting. Well, to me, you have nothing to lose and a lot to gain by leaving more fish in the river this year, said Garcia -- we have to take advantage of the bounty Nature has given us. Why not try something different this year? The alternatives that have been chosen in previous years certainly have yet to produce salmon recovery.

NMFS acknowledges that transportation is not the solution to the salmon problem, said Brown. I would argue on the other side, however, that transportation is not the cause of the salmon's decline. The information we have, when you specifically compare transported groups vs. groups that have been allowed to migrate in-river, shows pretty consistently that the transported groups survive at a higher rate than the in-river fish. We acknowledge that there are a lot of uncertainties associated with this data; we also acknowledge that conditions in 1997 will be different than conditions in the years that data was obtained, said Brown. However, even in past years when in-river conditions were good, transported fish survived better than in-river fish.

How do you rebut Ed's point that, in the 1982-'84 period, conditions very similar to the ones we'll see this spring produced a very high percentage of survival and returning adults, despite the fact that only a small percentage of those fish were transported? asked Hannigan. You'll get no argument from me that 1982-'84 were years in which chinook in particular did extremely well, Brown replied. To say that was attributable to the percentage of fish transported, rather than river conditions themselves, goes too far, however.

What happened to the original Idaho proposal to allow two-thirds of the fish to migrate in-river in 1997? asked Mitch Sanchotena. Essentially, the fishery agencies and tribes started talking about transportation percentages several months ago, Brown replied. A long list of operational

alternatives was developed; each of those alternatives was subjected to a detailed analysis to see what percentage of chinook and steelhead it would leave in the river. At the culmination of that process, the State of Idaho and CRITFC submitted a System Operational Request to the Corps. That SOR, in essence, is Alternative 7 on this list.

Since that SOR was submitted, there have been additional discussions to see if an alternative could be developed that might gain broader support than the support Alternative 7 had received, Brown continued. The Governor of Idaho submitted a proposal that two-thirds of the fish be allowed to migrate in-river in 1997, said Sanchotena. Has that proposal been abandoned? Have you made a unilateral decision, in other words, to take the Governor's plan off the table?

I think what Brian said is that it was a product of the technical folks' trying to work together to come up with a plan that everyone could agree to, said Darm -- I don't believe it could fairly be characterized as a "unilateral decision."

What about the transportation rule curve Phil Mundy has developed, under contract to NMFS, for inclusion in the Biological Opinion? asked Garcia. That study reviewed the available information on transport; it looked exclusively at chinook, and it tended to validate the finding that in-river fish seem to have a survival disadvantage relative to transported fish, Brown replied.

These fish have survived with no problem for millions of years in free-flowing water, said Eugene Greene Sr. of the Warm Springs tribe. How can you say, based on a few years of study, that fish are better off in barges? I think you're correct, said Stelle -- good, healthy free-flowing systems offer the conditions under which these fish are best able to prosper. However, that's not the kind of system we have today -- what we have is a highly-contorted migration corridor that bears only a passing resemblance to the environment in which these fish evolved. Dams kill fish, said Stelle, and given the current configuration of this system, as we try to evaluate where we have the greatest opportunity to bring about long-term survival improvement, what we've found is, fish that have to negotiate the dams in-river do not survive to adulthood as well as fish that are barged. The fundamental point, of course, is how do we change the system to improve survival and rebuild the runs? said Stelle.

I would like to make it clear, said John Haney, chief of staff to U.S. Rep. Mike Crapo of Idaho, that we are very supportive of Gov. Batt's original transportation proposal. We trust that what the Governor has proposed follows the best available science; we trust the common sense of a spread-the-risk philosophy; we respect other points of view, but we feel that Gov. Batt's original proposal is what makes the best sense for Idaho's salmon and steelhead.

The other point I would like to make is the fact that my boss sits on both the House Commerce Committee and the House Resources Committee, and he is very interested in the process used by this system to make decisions, Haney said. In the big picture, we are not just interested in what happens to these fish. In the larger reality, we are also talking about the other assets of the Snake and Columbia systems -- water, and the availability of affordable electricity. When you wrap all of that together, we are very concerned about the way decisions are made. As a matter of principal, we believe these are decisions that need to be made within the region, Haney said. In our view, however, the arbitrator of last resort should be the region, rather than a Federal agency.

I would note that the only apparent objectors to what is now Alternative 7 seem to be the Federal

agencies, Haney continued. Why is that, and based on what data or regulation? When this decision is made, we want to clearly understand the reasons behind that decision, so that we can evaluate the decisionmaking process. If adaptive management is good for fish, adaptive management will certainly be good for the decisionmaking process.

Again, Haney said, we support Gov. Batt's original transportation proposal. We feel that Alternative 7 is a disappointment; arriving at Alternative 7 is the function of a process, and we would like the Federal family to push its own envelope as far as it can.

A point of clarification, said Stelle -- did the states of Oregon, Washington and Idaho support Alternative 6? Washington, Oregon and Idaho stated that they would not object to Alternative 6, Darm replied. Actually, what we said was that we would not object to Alternative 6 if it resulted in a decision at the meeting, said Bowles. At this meeting, we first and foremost want Alternative 7 to be debated on its merits.

To respond to John Haney's remarks about the importance of regional decisionmaking, Stelle continued, I wonder what we're doing here today if not making decisions as a representative regional body? You indicate that you want to make sure that, in the absence of consensus on an operation or an issue, those with the authority to make judgements are required to under law, and we will do so, he said. I want to assure you and everyone at this table that, if that becomes necessary, we will explain our decision completely -- that's an important part of the process.

To put this issue in context, said Stelle, please understand that NMFS has an enforceable obligation to make recommendations to the Corps and Reclamation about how to operate the FCRPS, based on the best scientific information available. That is not a pat phrase, said Stelle, it is at the heart of Endangered Species Act decisionmaking. It is also a standard that is enforceable in courts of law, and when we deviate from that obligation, we get sued. We get sued based on whether or not we are complying with our ESA obligation, not based on whether or not we made a regional decision.

We have been sued on the issue of transportation before, in 1994, Stelle continued. Our decisions on transportation vs. in-river migration were challenged in Federal court, and the U.S. District Court ruled in NMFS's favor. That decision was appealed, and the 9th Circuit Court vacated further proceedings on the grounds that the issue itself was mooted. We have recently been challenged on whether or not the general framework of this Biological Opinion meets the requirements of law, Stelle said. As we noted this morning, yesterday the District Court ruled in our favor. Many elements of those challenges were based on deviations from the terms of the Biological Opinion. Yet today, we are being asked to make even more deviations.

So first of all, NMFS fully supports the efforts by us all to come to agreement, and a better understanding, of what kinds of measures we can pursue in order to improve survival and restore these salmon runs -- to pool our expertise and test ourselves and what we know, to maximize the likelihood that we, collectively, will make the right decision. That is what this process is all about, and we absolutely remain committed to it.

Idaho and CRITFC have put forward their proposal for a 1997 transportation strategy, said Stelle. The merits and demerits of that proposal have been thoroughly discussed at the technical level, and at the senior program level. While the framework of the Biological Opinion

contemplates a certain set of operations based on what we believe to be the best science available, we are also actively testing that science and generating new data to further evaluate whether or not the data we now have on transportation vs. in-river migration is solid.

I would also point out that the Federal agencies, too, have been willing to make some adjustments in the operations laid out in the Biological Opinion in order to achieve a regional consensus, Stelle continued -- it isn't just the states and tribes. In my view, we are prepared to do that again, but there have to be some sideboards. First of all, I don't want to make a judgement here today, or tomorrow, in the absence of an agreement here today, and find ourselves back in court. NMFS is absolutely committed to working with the states and tribes to forge an agreement that we can go forward with.

However, we believe, based on the evidence as we understand it, that, as a whole, this river system kills fish, Stelle said. We also believe that, as a whole, we will kill more fish by putting them in the river than we will by putting them in barges. We acknowledge that there are some uncertainties there; we are, with you, undertaking very aggressive evaluations of those uncertainties, and are also trying to run the river to maximize in-river survival, through the flow augmentation and spill programs. Again, we are willing to move toward a spread-the-risk policy in order to try to accommodate some of the perspectives of the states and tribes, said Stelle. But from our perspective, where we ended up last year is where we should be again in 1997.

In short, said Stelle, I think NMFS would be willing to embrace, as a policy matter, and in an attempt to reach consensus, an operation that would roughly spread the risk, and that would leave between 40% and 50% of the chinook to migrate in-river. I would prefer to ask the TMT or IT to determine what the best configuration of the system operation should be to achieve that transport percentage, and to move toward Idaho's proposal to reduce the percentage of steelhead transported.

To summarize, said Stelle, generally, as a matter of policy, NMFS is willing to move toward a spread-the-risk approach, within the terms of the Biological Opinion and recognizing that the uncertainties associated with transportation give us some degree of discretion. I further propose that we defer to the TMT to work out the details of an operation that will accommodate, to the greatest extent possible, the desire of Idaho and the tribes to minimize the percentage of steelhead transported, said Stelle.

I appreciate the fact that NMFS is willing to be flexible, said Mike Field of Idaho. However, in Idaho's opinion, both Alternatives 6 and 7 do fall within the flexibility allowed under the Bi-Op. You know where Idaho would like this decision to come to rest. If we can indeed move toward a spread-the-risk strategy, and can work out the details satisfactorily at the TMT or IT levels, from my perspective, that will be a good thing, said Field.

We concur with Mike's point that, at minimum, NMFS can accept Alternative 7 under the terms of the Biological Opinion, said Haney. We think the Governor's original proposal would also fall within the flexibility allowed under the Bi-Op. Lawsuits are an unfortunate fact of life in this business, although we would agree that the courts are not the ideal forum in which to set policy. On the other hand, we are not comfortable with retreating from what appears to be a policy proposal with broad support around this table, simply because we might get sued.

Point of information, said Bob Nichols of the Washington Governor's office: what exactly is the differential between survival rates for transported fish vs. in-river fish, according to NMFS's studies? The studies have shown, pretty consistently that, as a general rule, a 2-1 survival advantage for transported fish vs. in-river fish, Brown replied. That's correct, said Stelle, and while there is considerable debate about how that benefit ratio changes across a wide range of flows and in-river conditions, the data, as we understand them, show consistently that, in the system the way it is currently configured, there is a benefit to transportation across a wide range of conditions, on the order of a 2-1 advantage. That is why we may seem somewhat resistant to the idea of putting more fish in the river, Stelle said.

One point about that 2-1 ratio, said Bob Heinith of CRITFC -- there was a real problem with the study design, because the control fish were subjected to the same impacts as the treatment fish. You can't take that 2-1 ratio, and assume it is completely accurate. Understood, said Stelle.

The group exchanged views on this subject for some minutes. Ultimately, Lionel Boyer reiterated the the Shoshone-Bannock position that 100% of the 1997 migrants be allowed to migrate in- river. I guess I would ask who at this table objects to an operation that would allow two-thirds of the fish -- both steelhead and chinook -- to migrate in-river in 1997? asked Garcia. The National Marine Fisheries Service, for one, for reasons outlined in the 1995 Biological Opinion and subsequent records of decision, said Stelle. Oregon? asked Garcia. Our position has been to support Alternative 6, although we do not object to Alternative 7, replied Cohen. I would have to consult with our technical people before I could take a position on a two-thirds/one-third ratio, because this is not an option that has been vetted at the technical level. The State of Washington concurs Oregon's position, said Nichols.

Jay? asked Stelle. Our position is that we want to see more fish in the river, replied Jay Nelson of Alaska -- we would not object to allowing two-thirds of the fish to migrate in-river. Idaho? asked Stelle. Idaho would not object to allowing two-thirds of the fish to migrate in-river, said Field. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? asked Stelle. We would support allowing two-thirds of the fish to migrate in-river, replied Bill Shake.

Ultimately (for the sake of clarity) Darm summarized the results of this poll as follows:

The question is: "Who does not object to the implementation of..."

Alternative 6	Alternative 7	Two-Thirds In-River
Oregon	Oregon	USFWS
Washington	Washington	CRITFC
NMFS	Idaho	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
Alaska	Alaska	Nez Perce Tribes
Idaho	CBFWA	Spokane Tribe
-	USFWS	Yakima Tribe
-	Yakima Tribe	Umatilla Tribe
-	Umatilla Tribe	Idaho
-	-	Alaska

It's clear to some of us, at least, that there is not a consensus on this subject, said Stelle. In fact, it doesn't even appear to be close. Given the fact that no single alternative has attracted a consensus

in the Executive Committee forum, and the fact that the migration season is upon us, we need to provide the Federal operators with some guidance. In the absence of consensus, NMFS has the obligation to provide its advice to the Corps and the Bureau on the operation of the system.

The 1995 Biological Opinion stipulates a certain set of operations, which are reflected in Alternative 1, Stelle continued. Given our desire to move toward an accommodation of some of the other perspectives that have been expressed today, and the uncertainties associated with transportation benefits, particularly in high-flow years, NMFS is willing to move toward a spread-the-risk policy, akin to what was agreed to last year. My recommendation to the TMT would be to develop a scenario, whether it is Alternative 6 or a modification to Alternative 6, that targets a spread-the-risk 50% transport objective for listed fish, said Stelle. This operation, however, shall not result in less than 50% of the listed fish being transported. I would also like to give the TMT the flexibility to develop a scenario that, recognizing the interests of Idaho, tries to adjust Alternative 6 to reduce the percentage of steelhead transported as well.

Again, the rationale behind this decision, which I will put in writing and distribute to everyone here today, is based on our view of the available science, and of the ambiguities, and our efforts to move toward a position on this matter that better reflects the perspectives of the other sovereigns in this basin, Stelle continued. At the same time, the decision must be defensible under the Endangered Species Act.

I would ask that your written explanation include your reasons for rejecting Idaho's Alternative 7, said Bowles. I will make sure that it does, Stelle replied. This is an issue that is very important to Idaho and to the tribes, and we will continue to work with you at the TMT level, because we feel very strongly about it, said Field. Thank you for your consideration of our position.

I'd like to take one last shot at reaching consensus on Alternative 7, said Garcia. I think from my perspective, which is based on what we can defend in court based on the best scientific evidence available, it would be very difficult to defend a decision to transport less than 50% of the listed fish, given the configuration of the system as we now know it, said Stelle. If the information we have about transportation changes over time, you will see our position change over time as well. Frankly, I sincerely hope that it does, because the objective of this entire effort is to improve in-river survival. I understand the perspective of the tribes about the need to get fish back into the river, and I think that, fundamentally, that is the correct reference point to bring to this topic -- we need to fix the river, Stelle said.

C. Emergency Power Procedures (Decision Item). We have gone through many drafts at the TMT and IT levels to bring this product before you today, said BPA's Phillip Thor, distributing Enclosure F, the draft FCRPS Protocols for Emergency Operations in Response to Generation or Transmission Emergencies, dated 4/3/97. There is only one issue that remains to be decided: under Section C ("Goals"), item 1, the current document states that "An overall goal of this protocol is to prevent or minimize, and mitigate emergency-related FCRPS impacts to the fish protection measures in the Biological Opinions and RODs." BPA in particular objected to the words "and mitigate" in this sentence, because it creates an open-ended obligation to mitigate for all emergency situations.

After some minutes of discussion, the EC agreed to leave the words "and mitigate" in Goal 1 of Section C. However, at Stelle's suggestion, it was further agreed to add a footnote to this section:

"This document does not create legal rights or obligations on the part of any party." I should point out, he said, that the issue isn't whether or not there is as general obligation to mitigate for the adverse biological effects of emergency situations, because in my view, there is a general obligation to mitigate. However, said Stelle, that obligation is accompanied by a rule of reasonableness -- we will not be seeking unreasonable mitigation. It was agreed to adopt these protocols for use by the TMT, on an interim basis, with this change in place, and with the understanding that the protocols are subject to further review. It was further agreed that any comments on this document be submitted to the Implementation Team within 30 days.

D. Water Management and Fish Passage Plans (Information Item).

IV. Capital Construction in the Lower Snake River (Discussion Item).

Heinith distributed Enclosure G, a document titled "Tribal v. Federal Capital Construction Priorities, FY 1998 to 2001." As Will said before, Heinith began, we have to fix the dams if we're ever going to get to salmon recovery. That's really the heart of this issue, he said, what we have come to call the "forest" issue at the System Configuration Team.

What we have in capital construction priorities is two major pathways, Heinith continued. One is the Federal pathway, and the other is the pathway proposed by CRITFC, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and others. Chapter 3 of the 1997 draft Multi-Year Implementation Plan lays out the differences between the two pathways very clearly; at issue is how the approximately \$600 million described in the Memorandum of Agreement should be spent between 1997 and 2001.

The main difference between the tribal and Federal pathways is the fact that the tribal plan focuses on non-turbine passage, Heinith said -- we're asking that 80% of the fish pass the projects through non-turbine routes, and that we set a goal of 95% survival at each project. We are asking that this change be implemented by 2001. We have also established passage goals for adult salmon, with the objective of reducing delay and interdam mortality by 50% -- again, we are asking that that be done by 2001.

We have asked NMFS and the other Federal operating agencies if the 80%/95% goal is an acceptable performance standard, one that the region can agree can and should be implemented by 2001, Heinith continued. To date, we have yet to see any commitment to that goal on the part of the Federal entities. We believe that the capital construction program should be focused on the 80%/95% standard at each project, as well as on the 50% reduction in adult delay and mortality.

Other major differences between the tribal and Federal capital construction approaches include:

- The tribal approach calls for about \$350 million over the term of the MOA to Snake River and John Day drawdown; the Federal approach calls for about \$362 million to be allocated to screened bypass systems and transportation.

- The tribal approach calls for emphasis on adult passage, spill efficiency and meeting dissolved gas and temperature water quality standards. The Federal approach fails to appropriate adequate

funds toward these critical mainstem passage measures.

The bottom line, Heinith said, is that, while the tribal plan emphasizes drawdown at the four Lower Snake and John Day dams, the Federal plan concentrates much of the funding available under the MOA on improvements to the Lower Snake dams -- in essence, we're gold-plating these dams to such an extent that, if the region chooses the drawdown path in 1999, those investments will be stranded. The tribes are advocating that no more money be spent on screened bypass systems or transportation, and that's a real problem with the current Federal direction.

We're at a crossroads in 1998, Heinith continued. The Corps has already put its appropriation in for about \$127 million, and we're headed down the screened bypass/transportation road once again. At Bonneville Dam, \$28 million of the FY'98 budget has been appropriated to build a two-mile outfall pipe for juvenile passage, and that's only the beginning. The Federal parties would also like to install extended-length screens at Bonneville Dam, and by the time all is said and done, we will have spent \$150 million at Bonneville alone, out of the \$600 million available for the entire river. We won't have the money to do drawdown if we continue down this path.

Heinith spent a few minutes going through other specific differences between the capital construction projects called for in the tribal and Federal approaches (see Enclosure G for details). In summary, he said, there are a lot of very expensive projects coming on board in FY'98; the tribes believe that if we continue down the Federal pathway, the region will be precluded from moving in a different direction in the future. The tribes' position is that the region should consider placing in abeyance these Federal monies that would otherwise be spent on items that we have been unable to reach agreement on in terms of regional priority, until we have a chance to discuss and analyze them further, as a region.

This tribal approach was first discussed at the SCT, and in the absence of consensus, it was further discussed at the Implementation Team? asked Stelle. That's correct, Heinith replied. Can you describe some of the perspectives of different parties at those meetings on this topic? asked Stelle. Since we first began to run into disagreements about these priorities last year, Heinith replied, the tribes have essentially been the odd men out in those discussions. In general, the states concur with some, but not all, elements of the tribal approach.

The position that NMFS and some of the other members of the IT have taken is that our ability to make a decision about whether to move forward with certain capital construction items depends on what those items are, said Donna Darm of NMFS, the IT chair. It depends upon what the time-frame is for completion of those items, how much they cost, how they relate to what's gone on before and what benefits they can be expected to provide for fish. To us, the CRITFC "forest" issue is more of a fundamental philosophical question, and it was very difficult for us, frankly, to come to grips with this issue. There was a great deal of frustration at the IT level, primarily because CRITFC wanted to discuss this issue on a broader philosophical scale, while the IT tried to keep the focus on specific elements of the Federal program that CRITFC was objecting to, said Darm.

The Spokane Tribe expressed the position that the four Lower Snake dams should be mothballed, and the earthen portions removed, to return the Lower Snake to a free-flowing river. If the salmon runs continue to decline, they said, then you can always put the dams back in. The Spokane representative asked that the following note be read into the meeting record:

The Spokane Tribe believes the decision should be made now, and no further commitment should be made for capital costs to continue going down the path we are on now. It is especially crucial for us to consider the timing of this decision in light of the expiration of the MOA in 2001, and the pressure on BPA to cap its fish and wildlife costs and commit to a budget before sells its power through long-term contracts.

One of the things the tribes have been objecting to at the SCT and IT level is projects that would result in completion of screens and bypass systems at Lower Granite, Little Goose, Lower Monumental, Ice Harbor and McNary Dams, said Darm. These are systems in which we have already invested more than \$100 million, and are now 95% complete, 98% complete and, in the case of Lower Monumental, 100% complete. We're talking about an additional FY'98 expenditure of \$4.1 million to complete these projects. Our view is that, in order to make an intelligent, informed decision, we need to look at the percentage completion at those projects, how much has been invested already, and what benefits those projects will have for fish once they're completed. Even under an optimistic drawdown scenario, it will be five years before drawdown can be implemented, said Darm. Given the relatively small proportion of the FY'98 budget needed to complete these systems, it makes sense to spend the \$4 million to make them fully operational. I'm not trying to say we're right and you're wrong, Darm said, but that's an example of the kind of talking past each other that we've been doing at IT on this issue.

I think the tribes have raised a fundamentally important question with this issue, said Tom Cooney of WDFW: how does our spending over the next five years affect our ability to put whatever decision is made in 1999 in place? Our people have come to the SCT table with the goal of identifying projects that will provide long-term benefits, no matter which long-term option is selected, or that provide sufficient biological benefits in the interim that we can justify their cost. But this issue of how spending over the shorter term will affect our ability to implement whatever strategy is chosen in 1999 is not being effectively discussed at any of the regional forums. That said, Washington does not agree with everything the tribes are proposing in terms of different capital construction priorities; Washington does support the SCT's prioritizations within the FY'97 and FY'98 budgets.

Another question that needs to be discussed is whether we should be spending money on measures that will provide only interim benefits, if there is an opportunity to save that money and spend it on whatever strategy is chosen in 1999, Cooney said. So you're asking, do we need to start building a bank, and if so, should we begin reducing our spending in the interim in order to build that bank? said Stelle. That's correct, Cooney replied.

Do some of the ideas Tom has expressed about project-specific and interim spending strategies and banking strategies reflect the multi-dimensional nature of this issue from the tribal perspective? asked Stelle. Those are essentially the issues, as we see them, Heinith replied. So the tribal proposal reflects some differences on the utility of some of these interim Corps projects on their own merits, underscored by the larger issue of whether the region should begin implementing this banking strategy? asked Stelle. That's essentially correct, Heinith replied.

We're talking all around this issue, but it seems to me that there is a basic disagreement about what the Bi-Op provides, and what other people would like to do in lieu of the measures called for in the Bi-Op, said one EC participant. I'm not aware that there is anything in the Corps program that isn't called for under the Bi-Op. If you want to do some different things, then

perhaps what we're really saying is that the Bi-Op needs to be revisited, because this would appear to be a basic conflict with the program the Bi-Op lays out between now and 1999.

You're right to point out that there is a basic conflict here, said Darm, but it's not one that is inherent in the Biological Opinion -- it's one that is a result of the MOA. When the Bi-Op was written, there was an assumption that we would have the ability to finance whatever longterm strategy was chosen. However, the changing energy market, and the proposed cost cap legislation and resulting MOA have changed the playing field. I think what the tribes are responding to is the reality of future fish and wildlife funding in the region. The Biological Opinion is flexible enough to accommodate either of the paths we're discussing today, Darm said.

One of the problems with this process, from our perspective, is that the Corps appears to be dedicated to supporting the Bi-Op in every way they can, said Hannigan. That is the crux of our problem, in that we don't feel that we have the latitude to make independent judgements or decisions. Instead, we are relying on NMFS and the regional forum to make the ultimate decision. If NMFS would be willing to say we have some flexibility to act on our own, would the Corps then have the latitude to at least listen to some of our proposals?

As I understand the law we're operating under, it is the Endangered Species Act and the Biological Opinion, replied COE's Dave Geiger. Our Record of Decision, reflecting what we are going to do in terms of Bi-Op implementation, is our order of the day. Until there is some change in that -- reinitiation of consultation, changes to the Bi-Op or to our Record of Decision, the Corps is obligated to follow that pathway.

With all due respect to Lionel, I don't think this is a Biological Opinion issue per se, said Stelle. I think the structure of the Biological Opinion contemplates a couple of major pathways. What I'm really hearing here is that there is some disagreement about the degree to which financing will be available to implement either of the fundamental pathways under discussion today. There is also the more political question of whether we want to prejudice the choice between pathways by spending money, in the interim, on one or the other. The larger issue, however, is whether or not we have confidence that the funds will be available to implement one or the other of the recovery strategies.

At Stelle's request, Ed Sheets spent a few minutes discussing the financial analysis that has been conducted during the development of the Multi-Year Implementation Plan. What this analysis shows, first, is that funding under the first few years of the MOA is being driven by the repayment of the capital for decisions we're making about investment and construction that is going on right now, Sheets said. That capital growth is driving us up toward the \$252 million cap. The second thing you should be aware of is that our analysis assumes that, in 1999, the decision is made to either take the transportation path or the drawdown path. In either case, those have obvious construction implications. But also in either case, both paths significantly exceed the \$252 million cap. And this analysis does not factor in inflation, either for direct costs or reimbursibles. The bottom line, said Sheets, is that decisions that are being made today will indeed affect reality in the future.

After some minutes of further discussion, there was agreement that the EC would not be able to resolve the capital construction issue at today's meeting. Stelle requested that the IT begin to

develop a screening process or criteria through which the interim capital construction measures can be passed -- which projects should proceed, and which should not. The larger question, which is not an IT issue, is the funding issue, said Stelle -- what are our options for funding the two main pathways we will be choosing between in 1999, and should we defer spending, in the interim, in order to build a financial reserve?

One other issue, related to the question of timing, said Karen Garrison of the Natural Resources Defense Council -- the Harza report suggests that we can save a lot of money by making a decision earlier than 1999. It seems to me that someone should be charged with determining exactly what information we will have in 1999 that we don't have now, and making a judgement about whether it is really worth our while to wait until 1999 to make the final decision. I would suggest that the IT form a subgroup to look at this issue, and report back to the IT and EC within a certain time-frame, she said. So you're asking, what do we need to know that we don't already know, and if the answer is, very little, that we get on with making the 1999 decision sooner? asked Stelle. Correct, said Garrison. I would be comfortable with asking the IT to undertake this task, said Stelle.

So the IT is, first, to identify what information we will have in 1999 that we do not have now? said Darm. And how that information will be generated, said Stelle. Second, the IT is being asked to develop criteria for screening projects? asked Darm. Does that include the notion of piggybanking? asked Rob Lothrop of CRITFC. I don't think so, Stelle replied, although I do think we need to figure out how to analyze the need to piggybank. I don't see that as an IT issue, because it delves into issues that are well beyond the scope of the Implementation Team. Where do you see those discussions taking place? asked Alex Smith of BPA. I'm not sure at this point, Stelle replied. I think that's a question that goes beyond the basic mandate of this regional forum -- to implement the specific recovery efforts -- but at the same time, it is directly tied to that mandate. I will, however, make a commitment that we will confer with CRITFC and other entities about the best way to scope out an answer to that question. I think we need to do that soon -- I'm not trying to duck this issue, but I'm not sure at this point how to wrestle this monster issue to the ground.

V. 1999 Drawdown Decision Framework (Information Item).

This item was not discussed at today's meeting.

VI. Regional Forum Procedures (Information Item)

Hannigan requested that copies of the Regional Forum rules and procedures, together with meeting notes from the TMT, IT and SCT meetings and a chronology of the Regional Forum development, be made available for review prior to the next Executive Committee meeting; it was agreed that substantive discussion of the Regional Forum rules and procedures would be deferred until the EC participants have a chance to review these materials, and to evaluate the documentation of decisions made by the TMT, SCT and IT.

I would also ask that the tribal representatives think about where they would like to engage NMFS in a discussion of the Regional Forum rules and procedures, added Darm. About a year

ago, the EC asked the Implementation Team to develop those rules and procedures. While we were developing those rules and procedures, the Intertribe representatives said that the IT is not the proper forum for such a discussion. We set up the Alternative Dispute Resolution forum in response to the tribal concerns, she said. Last week, we heard from the Yakima Tribe that they no longer want to engage in discussions in the ADR forum. From NMFS's point of view, said Darm, we are willing to engage you in any forum that works, but we need your help. If you can tell us how you would like to engage in those discussions, we will put that on the agenda for the next EC meeting.

I guess the word I was searching for this morning was "authority," said Hannigan -- under what authority did this forum come into existence? It's voluntary, Stelle replied -- it is a voluntary undertaking on all of our parts, in recognition of the need for a place to come together and discuss all of these matters. We are not doing so under a particular authority -- it is a collective commitment. It is also understood that we need some procedures so that we all understand how the process will work. We will distribute what has been developed in the IT and ADR processes, and then it will be up to the individual tribes to decide to make a judgement about where further discussion of the Regional Forum rules and procedures should take place.

VII. Next Executive Committee Meeting Date, Location and Agenda Items.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee was tentatively set for Monday, June 23, in Spokane, if needed to address in-season issues. The next regular EC meeting was set for Monday and Tuesday, September 22-23. Meeting notes prepared by Jeff Kuechle, BPA contractor.